UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/695,631	10/24/2000	Mary A. Flanagan	MUL1612-002	2778

8698 7590 03/16/2004

STANDLEY LAW GROUP LLP
495 METRO PLACE SOUTH
SUITE 210
DUBLIN, OH 43017

EXAMINER	
WOZNIAK, JAMES S	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2655	3

DATE MAILED: 03/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/695,631	FLANAGAN ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	James S. Wozniak	2655	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *10/24/2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-22* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15, 17, 18, 20-22* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *16,19* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *24 October 2000* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *2*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

Detailed Action

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. **Claim 15** is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. **Claim 15** recites the limitation "the step of pre-editing" in Line 1. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. **Claims 1, 3, 5, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, and 17** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee *(US2001/0037510)* in view of Hiroi et al *(*JP 10234016 A*)*.

With respect to **Claim 1**, Lee discloses:

A system for closed caption data translation comprising:

A closed caption decoder for extracting caption codes from a signal comprising closed caption data *(decoder, Fig. 2, Element 20, for decoding transmitted character information associated with audio/video data, Paragraph [0034-0035])*;

A server adapted to receive said caption codes and translate text in said closed caption codes *(translation relay site server, Fig. 2, Element 26, that translates character information of a particular language into another according to user preference, Paragraph [0018])*; and

A device for receiving translated text from said server *(control unit, Fig. 2, Element 22, for receiving translated character information, Paragraph [0016], Lines 3-5)*.

Lee does not specifically disclose server reception of caption codes from a decoder, nor the system application as applied to closed captioning, however Hiroi recites: *a closed caption decoder that creates a character string from input video, which is then supplied to a translation section for character translation into a user selected language, SOLUTION Paragraph.*

Lee and Hiroi are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the closed caption translation system featuring a caption decoder that supplies caption character strings to a translation section as taught by Hiroi with the system capable of translating audio/video character data such as captions, Paragraph [0053], containing a decoder for character extraction, interface to a translation server, and means for receiving translated characters for television display as taught by Lee to create a caption translation system compatible with the closed captioning standard featuring a means to immediately transmit received decoded caption information from a decoder to a translation server functioning as a translation section. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine

Hiroi with Lee for the benefit of obtaining a closed caption translation system featuring immediate transmission of decoded caption data to a translation server for more efficient caption translation processing, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 1.

With respect to **Claim 3**, Lee further suggests:

Said device of Claim 1 is a subtitler *(It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, that the method of translating a caption, a representation of program dialogue, into another language is analogous to the process of subtitling, which presents a text representation of a foreign language program in a specified user language. Therefore the control unit taught by Lee, and as applied to Claim 1, could be also considered a subtitler since it receives and processes translated foreign text representative of program dialog for display.)*.

With respect to **Claim 5**, Lee adds:

The system of claim 1 wherein said signal is from a television broadcast *(character information included with a television broadcast signal, Paragraph [0018])*.

With respect to **Claim 7**, Lee further discloses:

Said server comprises text flow management software *(management of character data for translation at a server site, Fig. 4. It would also be obvious that the translation process could be performed using a translation program, as would have been well known in the art at the time of invention, which would thus manage text as character data is translated)*.

With respect to **Claim 9**, Lee discloses:

A method for translating closed caption data comprising the steps of:

Receiving program source signals *(antenna receiving broadcast signals, Paragraph [0026], Lines 5-6)*;

Decoding text from caption data in said program source signals *(decoder, Fig. 2, Element 20, for decoding caption data associated with a program, Paragraph [0034]-[0035])*;

Translating said text from a source language to a target language *(translation of character information into a user selection language by a translation server, Paragraph [0039])*;

Inserting said target language text in program destination signals *(translated character information replacing original language character information associated with AV data which is then sent to a control unit and further processed by a decoder, which decodes the translated character information associated with an AV signal, Paragraph [0039-0041])*; and

Transmitting said program destination signals to a program destination *(Paragraph [0039])*.

Lee does not specifically teach the method application as applied to closed captioning however Hiroi recites: *a closed caption translation system, SOLUTION Paragraph.*

Lee and Hiroi are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the closed caption translation system as taught by Hiroi with the method for translating audio/video character data such as captions, Paragraph [0053], featuring a decoder for character extraction from a received program signal, translation server for translating text into a target language, and means for transmitting translated characters as taught by Lee to create a caption translation method for use with closed captioning in order to provide

increased translation method compatibility, since closed captioning is a well-known and widely-used form of captioning . Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hiroi with Lee for the benefit of obtaining a caption translation method compatible with the well-known closed caption standard, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 9.

With respect to **Claim 10**, Lee adds:

Receiving the program source signals from a broadcast *(character information included with a television broadcast signal, Paragraph [0018]).*

With respect to **Claim 12**, Lee further suggests:

Inserting target language text in program destination signals as subtitles *(It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, that the method, as applied to Claim 9, of translated captions replacing original language captions, a representative of program dialogue, is analogous to the process of subtitling, which presents a text representation of a foreign language program in a specified user language. Therefore, the translated text and associated AV signal processed by the translation server and received by the control unit taught by Lee as applied to Claims 1 and 9, could be also considered a subtitle signal, since the text is a translation representative of foreign program dialog.)*

With respect to **Claim 13**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the translation of program signals containing closed captions as applied to Claim 9.

With respect to **Claim 17**, Lee suggests:

An apparatus for closed caption translation comprising:

A server adapted to receive caption codes and transmit text in a target language *(translation server for translating captions into a user selection language, Paragraph [0018])*; and

Machine translation software on said server for translating text in said closed caption codes from a source language to said target language *(It would have been obvious that the translation process could be performed using a translation program, a translation means that would have been well known in the art at the time of invention.)*

Lee does not specifically teach a translation system as applied to closed captioning however Hiroi recites: *a closed caption translation system, SOLUTION Paragraph.*

Lee and Hiroi are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the closed caption translation system as taught by Hiroi with the system for translating audio/video character data such as captions, Paragraph [0053], featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language as taught by Lee to create a caption translation method for use with closed captioning in order to provide increased translation method compatibility, since closed captioning is a well-known and widely-used form of captioning. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Hiroi with Lee for the benefit of obtaining a caption translation system compatible with the well-known closed caption standard, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 17.

6. **Claim 2, 6, 8, 11, 18, and 21** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hiroi et al, and in further view of Lange et al *(US2001/0025241)*.

With respect to **Claim 2**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the caption translation system as applied to Claim 1 in which a translation server translates closed captions received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a reception unit. Lee in view of Hiroi does not specifically teach the reception unit embodied as a closed caption encoder as recited in Claim 2, however Lange discloses:

Said device is a closed caption encoder *(conventional encoder used for receiving and processing text data to produce a captioned AV signal, Paragraph [0020], Lines 1-5).*

Lee, Hiroi, and Lange are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption character manipulation featuring means for caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the use of a well known caption encoder for receiving and processing caption data as taught by Lange with the caption translation system in which a translation server translates closed captions received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a reception unit as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to provide an encoder, functioning in a manner well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, within a captioning system in order to offer a well known means of easily processing translated closed caption characters for display by using an encoder . Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lange with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a closed caption translation system utilizing an encoder, well known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention, as a means of receiving and processing caption data for display, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 2.

With respect to **Claim 6**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the caption translation system as applied to Claim 1 in which a translation server translates closed caption signals received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a reception unit. Lee in view of Hiroi does not specifically teach the signal containing a caption from a videotape recorder as recited in Claim 6, however Lange discloses:

Said signal is from a videotape recorder *(AV signal source from a video cassette recorder, Paragraph [0020], Lines 6-11).*

Lee, Hiroi, and Lange are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption character manipulation featuring means for caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine a video tape recorder caption-containing signal source as taught by Lange with the caption translation system in which a translation server translates closed captions received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a reception unit as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to implement a translation system for a caption-containing signal from an A/V source in a videotape recorder in order to increase system compatibility, since a videotape recorder is a common A/V signal source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lange with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a closed caption translation system compatible with a common AV signal source in a videotape recorder, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 6.

With respect to **Claim 8**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the caption translation system as applied to Claim 1 in which a translation server translates closed caption signals received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a

reception unit. Lee in view of Hiroi does not teach a server containing pre-editing software as recited in Claim 8, however Lange discloses:

Said server comprises pre-editing software *(speech processing system capable of loading user interface software for operation of an AV captioning system, Paragraph [0018], Lines 19-22, and, in the case of incorrectly transcribed text, the option of a user to edit the incorrect captions before display, Paragraph [0031], Lines 27-29).*

Lee, Hiroi, and Lange are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption character manipulation featuring means for caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the caption pre-editing software as taught by Lange with the caption translation system in which a translation server translates closed captions received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a reception unit as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to correct captions which may have been incorrectly transcribed or translated at the server before the caption is sent to the receiving device for display, thus providing higher captioning accuracy. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lange with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a more accurate closed caption translation system through the error correction of captions before display utilizing pre-editing software on a translation server, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 8.

With respect to **Claim 11**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the method for translating closed captions featuring a decoder for character extraction from a received program signal, translation server for translating text into a target language, and means for transmitting translated characters

as applied to Claim 9. Lee in view of Hiroi does not teach receiving program source signals from a videotape recorder as specified in Claim 11, however Lange discloses:

Receiving program source signals from a videotape recorder *(AV signal source from a videocassette recorder, Paragraph [0020], Lines 6-11)*.

Lee, Hiroi, and Lange are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption character manipulation featuring means for caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine a video tape recorder caption-containing signal source as taught by Lange with the method for translating closed captions featuring a decoder for character extraction from a received program signal, translation server for translating text into a target language, and means for transmitting translated characters as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to implement a translation system for a caption-containing signal from an A/V source in a videotape recorder in order to increase system compatibility, since a videotape recorder is a common A/V signal source. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lange with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a closed caption translation method compatible with a common AV signal source in a videotape recorder, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 11.

With respect to **Claim 18**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language as applied to Claim 17. Lee in view of Hiroi does not teach pre-editing software on a server for pre-editing text in a source language as recited in Claim 18, however Lange discloses:

Pre-editing software on a server for pre-editing text in a source language *(speech processing system capable of loading user interface software for operation of an AV captioning*

system, Paragraph [0018], Lines 19-22, and, in the case of incorrectly transcribed text, the option of a user to edit the incorrect captions before display, Paragraph [0031], Lines 27-29).

Lee, Hiroi, and Lange are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption character manipulation featuring means for caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the caption pre-editing software as taught by Lange with the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to correct captions which may have been incorrectly transcribed to avoid translation errors at the translation server before the caption is sent to a receiving device for display, thus providing higher captioning accuracy. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Lange with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a more accurate closed caption translation system through the error correction of captions before display utilizing pre-editing software on a translation server, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 18.

With respect to **Claim 21**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language and Lange adds the use of pre-editing software as both applied to Claim 18.

7. **Claims 4 and 14** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hiroi et al, and in further view of Kirkland *(U.S. Patent: 5,900,908)*.

With respect to **Claim 4**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the caption translation system as applied to Claim 1 in which a translation server translates closed captions received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a

reception unit. Lee in view of Hiroi does not specifically teach the reception unit embodied in a text-to-speech module, however Kirkland recites:

Said device is a text-to-speech module *(text-to-speech device that outputs synthesized speech corresponding to received captions, Col. 3, Lines 29-45)*.

Lee, Hiroi, and Kirkland are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption processing including a means of caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the text-to-speech caption synthesizer as taught by Kirkland with the caption translation system in which a translation server translates closed captions received from a decoder into a user specified language and then transmits translated closed caption data to a reception unit as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to create a caption translation system capable of providing a synthesized speech output corresponding to a caption to a viewer unable to read the captions *(Kirkland, Col. 3, Lines 41-43)*. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kirkland with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a caption translation system accessible to a user unable to read program captions, through the use of a text-to-speech synthesizer, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 4.

With respect to **Claim 14**, Lee in view of Hiroi teaches the method for translating closed captions featuring a decoder for character extraction from a received program signal, translation server for translating text into a target language, and means for transmitting translated characters as applied to Claim 9. Lee in view of Hiroi does not teach a program signal as a SAP as recited in Claim 14, however Kirkland discloses:

Program destination signals as a SAP *(translating captions associated with a SAP signal, Col. 8, Lines 42-50)*.

Lee, Hiroi, and Kirkland are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption processing including a means of caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the method of translating captions associated with a SAP signal as taught by Kirkland with the method for translating closed captions featuring a decoder for character extraction from a received program signal, translation server for translating text into a target language, and means for transmitting translated characters as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi to create a closed caption translation system capable of providing translated captions synchronized with a SAP signal so that a viewer can read and hear program dialog simultaneously in a preferred language. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kirkland with Lee in view of Hiroi for the benefit of obtaining a closed caption translation system capable of translating captions synchronized with a program SAP so that a viewer can view and hear dialog simultaneously, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 14.

8. **Claims 20 and 22** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee in view of Hiroi in further view of Lange, and in further view of Kirkland.

With respect to **Claim 20**, Lee in view of Hiroi, in further view of Lange, teaches the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language, also containing pre-editing software as applied to Claim 18. Lee in view of Hiroi in further view of Lange does not teach text in a target language comprising translated titles as recited in Claim 20, however Kirkland discloses:

Text in a target language comprising translated titles *extended data service that supplies program information to a viewer, such as the title, Col. 2, Lines 56-65).*

Lee, Hiroi, Lange, and Kirkland are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption processing including a means of caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the inclusion of extended data service to provide program information such as titles as taught by Kirkland with the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language, also containing pre-editing software as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi, in further view of Lange, to create a closed caption translation system that can provide a viewer with text information descriptive of a program title, translated into a user selected language in the same manner as caption text. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kirkland with Lee in view of Hiroi, in further view of Lange, for the benefit of obtaining a closed caption translation system capable of providing a viewer with program title information, translated into a selected language in the same manner as a caption, for program identification, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 20.

With respect to **Claim 22**, Lee in view of Hiroi, in further view of Lange, teaches the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language, also containing pre-editing software as applied to Claim 18. Lee in view of Hiroi in further view of Lange does not teach text in a target language comprising translated audio as recited in Claim 22, however Kirkland recites:

Text in a target language comprising translated audio *(translating captions associated with a SAP signal, Col. 8, Lines 42-50).*

Lee, Hiroi, Lange, and Kirkland are analogous art because they are from a similar field of endeavor in caption processing including a means of caption translation. Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to combine the method of translating captions associated with a SAP signal as taught by Kirkland with the system for translating closed captions, featuring a translation server for translating text into a target language, also containing pre-editing software as taught by Lee in view of Hiroi, in further view of Lange, Hiroi to create a more accurate closed caption translation system capable of providing translated captions synchronized with a SAP signal so that a viewer can read and hear program dialog simultaneously in a preferred language. Therefore, it would have been obvious to combine Kirkland with Lee in view of Hiroi, in further view of Lange, for the benefit of obtaining a more accurate closed caption translation system through pre-editing software, capable of translating captions synchronized with a program SAP so that a viewer can view and hear dialog simultaneously, to obtain the invention as specified in Claim 22.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. **Claims 16 and 19** are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: prior art does not teach:

- Pre-editing process of Claim 15, which further includes the step of identifying a speaker as recited in **Claim 16**.
- Pre-editing software on a caption translation server utilizing a process including: identifying a topic to select a dictionary for translation, correcting spelling errors, identifying and demarcating names, phrase boundaries, and sentence boundaries, adding punctuation, identifying ellipses and inserting text, and inserting accents where appropriate as recited in **Claim 19**.

Conclusion

11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

- Li et al *(US2001/0044726)*- discloses a method that allows user selection of a subtitle language, which utilizes a translation server in the translation process.
- Gallup et al *(U.S. Patent: 6,658,627)*- teaches a text document translation system containing software featuring: a spell checker, grammar constraints, and recognition of sentence and word boundaries.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James S. Wozniak whose telephone number is (703) 305-8669 and email is James.Wozniak@uspto.gov. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays, 8:30-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis Ivars Smits can be reached at (703) 306-3011. The fax/phone number for the Technology Center 2600 where this application is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the technology center receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

James S. Wozniak
3/9/2004

TALIVALDIS IVARS SMITS
PRIMARY EXAMINER